Tom Mangold, his "Cold Warrior", James J. Angleton - 7/1/91

a few additional comments and observations on completing the book.

Newspaper reporters, at least in theory, do not include opinions in their news stories and are not supposed to. In theory opinions and most interpretations are for the editorial and oped pages. However, a reporter who writes a book in which he deals with events and people both arcane and of great significance, for which he is qualified to undertake such a book he has to be at the very least quite well informed, assumes additional obligations. These include, for a work like this book, explanations, interpretations and opinions where called for. The reader lacks the ability to do this for himself. And the reader is looking for more than pleasure in reading, for more than facts. He is looking for understanding of what is a mystery to him. It can also be fairly said that given what Mangold recounts, sometimes in considerable detail, he owes his reader his personal judgements along with a statement of where he stands, what he believes, what his political views are, so the reader can, assuming honesty, make his own evaluation of Mangold's judgement. He avoids any judgement and on interpretation, where he has it, such as the illegality of some of Angleton's projects, like Operation Chaos, sowing disunity and making other trouble for the anti-war movement, and the mail-interception program (which Mangold mentions almost only in passing, considerable understates and in which he entirely eliminates the fact that the actual interception was by the FBI), he quotes others as saying that it was illegal. Without any explanation of why or how. Or for that matter, given the fact that it was by government agencies, whether or not it violated the Constitution.

My own beliefs and opinions grew and became clearer the farthur I got into the book. I recall nothing I wrote several days ago that I think should be withdrawn. I am more convincted that he cast himself as Dr. Faustus and, having done so, showed nothing but respect for his Mephistopheles, the CIA as an institution.

If he made the deal I believe he made and withholds any inkling of it from his reader and his publisher he is dishonest.

This does not mean that what he reports is not accurate. But it assures questions about what he does not report. And this also gets to what I say above that is missing entirely from this book.

As I read I annotated the book and made a few handwritten notes in a notebook that will be in the file and I do not here take time for.

One omission that surprises me is what Mangold could and should have learned from OSS people, particularly those who served in Italy. Angleton was X-2, or counterintelligence there. Reports that passed through my hands when I was in OSS, in that day when there was less practise of the "need-to-know" concept, reported that the Nazis had penetrated OSS Italy to the extent that it was not uncommon for intelligence teams to be captured as soon as they were in the field.

This does indicate that Angleton's performance there was not good. If not worse.

I think it may also indicate something else about what he was doing then, and I wondered more about this the farthur I got into the book. I think he then was a political operator and that past the enemy Nazies he saw the bigger enemy, all the world he regarded as "red". (In mentioning Angleton's friendship with the ex-patriot poet Ezra Pound I do not recall that Mangold reported that Pound was pro-Mussolini, as he was.)

There is no indication of Angleton's political views and beliefs and the farthur I got into the book the more I came to think that he was an authoritarian. The two projects referred to above are only partial indication of this. It is Ollie North-clear on 351 where without comment or explanation of any kind where Mangold refers to the question asked of Angleton by Senator Richard Schweiker of the Church (intelligence-activities) committee, why the CIA's stock of very dangerous shell-fish toxin had not been destroyed:

"Angleton made this extraordinary reply:'It is inconceivable that a secret intelligence arm of the government has to comply with all the overt orders of the government'."

This response could have come from the Gestapo or the KGB that Angleton hated. It is an anti-American, anti-Constitution response.

Mangold does say it is "extraordinary." But he does not say or even indicate why or how. Or that it says anything at all about Angleton and the principles by which he lived abd worked — controlled what should have been and wasn't (which Mangold also does not say) counterintelligence for the U.S. government and its people.

That Angleton was a practising and believing authoritarian could not have been lost

on Mangold and certainly could not have been on those above Angleton throughout his entire CIA career. I separate superiors from the innumerable CIA employees not his superiors because his superiors had added obligations, above all to live within the law and to see to it that those under them did.

Helms in particular shares responsibility for Angleton's innumerable and endless illegalities - really subversions, ranging from The Constitution to The Warren Commission.

Mangold treats Helms kindly and omits what was relevant and of which he knew, how he testified to the House Select Committee on Assassinations, what he said on leaving the court when he was convicted of the much lesser crime with which he was charged for his own offenses. Helms made it clear that he and Angleton stand side by side on the CIA's immunity from the laws of the land and was even indignant and did not hide it when it was suggested otherwise and when he was changed and convicted with a wrist-slap only. (Joined in by his prestigeous counsel Edward Bennett Williams, who had been a member of the Presidents's Foreign Intelligence Board. It was supposed to oversee what the CIA did and it never did anything about what the Helmses and Angletons were doing and it had to know they were doing or it did not meet its obligations.) Mangold cites the HSCA records and the newspapers when it served his interest.

Here he did not when it served his readers' interest. Or his own integrity's.

(He has nothing further about this and other toxins or the many other such activities but if he had, he'd not have found it as easy to exculpate all those above Angleton who for all practical purposes encourages and protected him - agreed with what he was doing.)

That Angleton had a political agenda is obvious to the informed reader who takes the time to think and analyze. But most readers are not informed and are not in a position to make these kinds of judgements. The head of counterintelligence has every right to his own political beliefs but he has no right to impose them on his duties and actions. I think one writing about them has no right to entirely ignore them, as Mangold does.

In this regard, he uses a name I've never heard used before and I think is of his own creation for his own purposes. He refers to the Angletonians in the CIA as "The Fundamentalists." They were in fact the conservatives in the CIA. If as I've come to believe Man-

gold is a British Conservative, this abnormal use of the word that in this country has been reserved for those of the religious right extreme is explained. (He makes no mention, often as he refers to Peter Wright, of ~~his~~ Wright's similar political views - says though that he and Angleton were friends.)

It is Wright, as Mangold knows, who made first public mention of the plotting by his fellow British Angletonians (Convseratives in Britain) of which Wright was part to overthrown the elected ~~Prime Minister, Harold Wilson.~~ (It began with Angleton/Golitsyn) For that matter, in his passing reference to this, despite all the notes he has Mangold omits much, such as citation of the books he knew had been published holding such information, particularly one on it, "The Wilson Plot."

Accident? Carelessness? I think not.

I do intend to suggest that Mangold has his own political agenda in this book.

It would be unfair to hold any author to account for all of what can be regarded as omissions in a book like this but some cannot be easily explained. For example, with the great importance of Yuri Nosenko in and to this book and particularly because as I have already noted Mangold lied about what Nosneko told the FBI about Oswald and the KGB, how can the CI liaison role with the Warren Commission be entirely omitted? (Much of it handled by Raymond Rocca, mentioned a couple of times only by Mangold, buttressed by Helms when buttressing was needed, as the CIA believed with Nosenko it was.) How can the ~~tatlx~~ total lack of mention of this role and what CIA said and did be ignored with honesty of intent?

I think this again gets to Mangold as Faust. He did <u>not</u> do what he had <u>not</u> to do for his Mephistopheles, the CIA. Without which he would not have had this book.

In many ways it is a fine and informative book and will tell readers much, entirely new to most of them. It is informative, very informative.

But as with Colby and those "crown jewels" when as DCI he understood that some confessions were inevitable, could no longer be avoided, what Mangold evolves serves the CIA's interest. It cleans the CIA' skirts while still hiding much of its dirt. It exculpates the CIA as an organization, exculpates those above Angleton were were responsible and were not ignorant, and the rest is buried now.

For any who in the future may read this and not know, when CI for the CIA talked the

Warren Commission out of taking secret testimony from Yuri Nosenko what it was really doing is keeping the Commission from having informed testimony that Oswald was suspected of having a United States intelligence connection, the Oswald accused of assassinating the President, and that contrary to the picture of Oswald painted officially, of him as a "red", he was in fact anti-Soviet and anti-American Communist.

Had Nosenko testified it would have been close to impossible if not impossible for the official solution to be given to the world by the Warren Commission.

This is not to exculpate the Commission. The first "dirty runor" it got was that Oswald did have such a connection. I've published two of its executive session transcripts relating to this.

With any testimony from Nosenko the Commission would have had great difficulty keeping it secret on the one hand and ignoring it on the other.

This gets to two other of Mangold's omissions of what those who worked with him knew about and he also should have known about.

One of these is the "analysis" of this assassination prepared for the CIA, read Angleton, I think at his request, by an unidentified Russian defector, read Golistyn. (It is utterly irrational, a political diatribe.) The other is the proposed questions to be addressed to the USSR, as I've indicated guaranteed to infuriate and insult it and so terribly outrageous they could not be sent or asked. After that others feared asking the obvious questions. Thus, although the FBI and CIA and Commission knew of the existence of faily voluminous KGB files on Oswald and what they held they were not requested. Because they were not requested, the USSR could not send them.

This IS to say that the Mangold who lied about what Nosenko said continued covering the CIA by his omission of what is so very relevant to his Angleton/Golistyn/CIA book.